

## REMARKS

### 1. Introduction

In the Office Action mailed January 3, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zimmerman, U.S. Patent No. 6,745,040 (“Zimmerman”) in view of Stillman, U.S. Patent No. 6,870,915 (“Stillman”).

In response, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 8.

For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the claims, as amended herein.

### 2. Response to Rejections

#### a. Claims 1-8

Of these claims, claim 1 is independent. The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under § 103 as being unpatentable over Zimmerman in view of Stillman. In response, Applicants have amended claim 1 to clarify that the “first request” is a “first incoming call request” and that “transmitting a query to a call control system” occurs “in response to said first incoming call request.” These amendments are supported, for example, by Figure 2 and its associated description in the present application. Applicant submits that amended claim 1 is clearly allowable over the Zimmerman/Stillman combination, as set forth below.

The Examiner has acknowledged that Zimmerman does not disclose “transmitting a query to a call control system, said query identifying said first directory number.” Instead, the Examiner has relied on Stillman for this element. However, although the Examiner has apparently identified SCP 42 in Stillman as the call control system, the Examiner has not

established that Stillman discloses transmitting a query to SCP 42 wherein the query identifies the first directory number. Thus, the Examiner has not established that Stillman discloses “transmitting a query to a call control system, said query identifying said first directory number,” as recited in claim 1.

In particular, the Examiner has cited to the Abstract of Stillman. However, the Abstract does not refer to an SCP. In addition, whereas claim 1 recites “said query *identifying* said first directory number,” the Abstract refers to a query that is made in order *to obtain* a directory number. Specifically, the Abstract refers to “a call to a directory assistance service to obtain a directory number for the called party.”

The Examiner also cited to col. 2, lines 42-67 of Stillman. However, this section also does not refer to an SCP. Moreover, claim 1 has been amended to specify that “transmitting a query” occurs in response to an incoming call request. Although this section of Stillman discloses that the subscriber may be prompted to determine whether the directory number obtained from the directory assistance service should be added to the subscriber’s address book (col. 2, lines 42-46), the prompting is not in response to an *incoming* call request. To the contrary, the process of obtaining the directory number and prompting the user regarding the directory number occurs in the context of the subscriber making an *outbound* call to the directory number (col. 2, lines 5-19).

The Examiner further cited to col. 4, lines 3-22 of Stillman. Once again, this section does not refer to an SCP. Moreover, this section does not teach “transmitting a query” in response to an *incoming* call request, as in amended claim 1. Although the section refers to querying a

customer profile database and prompting the subscriber, these steps occur in the context of the subscriber making an *outbound* call (col. 3, lines 44-49).

Finally, the Examiner cited to col. 10, lines 20-41 of Stillman. That section also does not mention an SCP (though the section is part of the overall method illustrated in Figure 3, which does not involve an SCP). In addition, this section does not refer to “transmitting a query ... said query *identifying* said first directory number.” Instead, the section describes how voice services node 56 *obtains* the directory number, e.g., by parsing the subscriber’s address book.

It is true that Stillman discloses transmitting queries to an SCP, as shown in steps 315 and 335 in Figure 3. However, Applicant submits that those queries do not identify “said first directory number,” i.e., the directory number that is desired to be called, as recited in claim 1. At step 315, a trigger at the subscriber’s SSP causes a query to SCP 42 for routing and processing instructions (col. 10, lines 1-3). However, this query does not identify a directory number that is desired to be called because, at that point, the subscriber has not dialed a directory number but has simply gone off-hook or dialed a service code (col. 9, lines 52-67). The directory number that the subscriber desires to be called is obtained later, by voice services node 56 (col. 10, lines 20-33).

At step 335, the subscriber’s SSP launches a second query to SCP 42 (col. 10, lines 42-49). However, this query also does not identify the directory number that is desired to be called. This is evident from the fact that the *response* from SCP 42 identifies the called party’s directory number (col. 10, lines 49-54). Thus, although Stillman teaches querying an SCP, the queries to the SCP do not identify “said first directory number,” as in claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1, as amended, is allowable over Zimmerman and Stillman for at least the foregoing reasons. Applicants further submit that claims 2-8 are allowable for at least the reason that they are dependent on an allowable claim.

**b. Claims 9-13**

Of these claims, claim 9 is independent. The Examiner has rejected claim 9 under § 103 as being unpatentable over Zimmerman in view of Stillman. However, Applicant submits that the Zimmerman/Stillman combination does not teach the recited element of “said call control system storing, externally to said mobile station, an association between said first directory number and an identifier code recognized by said mobile station.”

The Examiner has acknowledged that Zimmerman does not teach this element but has alleged that Stillman does. Specifically, the Examiner has alleged that the “directory assistance service” referenced in Stillman “includes a large database containing the names, addresses, and directory numbers for a number of telecommunications systems subscribers, a directory number, typically a ten digits number is referred to as a telephone number.” *See* Office Action, p. 5.

However, the Examiner’s rationale fails to specify any “identifier code recognized by said mobile station,” as recited in claim 9. Clearly, a directory assistance service may store an association between a directory number and the name and address of the party at that directory number (Stillman, col. 2, lines 49-59). However, neither the name nor the address is described in Stillman as being an identifier code that is *recognized* by the mobile station. Rather, it is the user of the mobile station that is likely to recognize the name and address. Thus, Stillman does not teach “storing, externally to said mobile station, an association between said first directory number and an identifier code recognized by said mobile station,” as recited in claim 9.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 9 is allowable over Zimmerman and Stillman for at least the foregoing reasons. Applicants further submit that claims 10-13 are allowable for at least the reason that they are dependent on an allowable claim.

**c. Claims 14-18**

Of these claims, claim 14 is independent. The Examiner has rejected claim 14 under § 103 as being unpatentable over Zimmerman in view of Stillman. In response, Applicants submit that this rejection is clearly improper, and should be withdrawn, because the Examiner has not shown that each and every element of claim 14 is disclosed in the Zimmerman/Stillman combination.

In particular, claim 14 recites, *inter alia*, “routing said call to said called party, such that said *first* directory number is identified as a *calling party number*.” As recited in the preamble of claim 14, the mobile station that originates the call has a plurality of directory numbers, including at least the *first* directory number and a *second* directory number. The result of the method of claim 14 is that the call from the mobile station is routed so that the calling mobile station is identified by its *first* directory number, from among its plurality of directory numbers. In contrast, Stillman does not teach routing a call such that a calling mobile station is identified by a first directory number out of a plurality of directory numbers for the mobile station. Indeed, Stillman does not teach a mobile station with a plurality of directory numbers at all.

Moreover, although Stillman teaches obtaining a directory number from a directory assistance service, the obtained directory number corresponds to the *called* party, rather than to the *calling* party (col. 2, lines 8-19).

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 14 is allowable over Zimmerman and Stillman for at least the foregoing reasons. Applicants further submit that claims 15-18 are allowable for at least the reason that they are dependent on an allowable claim.

3. **Conclusion**

Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is hereby requested. Should the Examiner feel that further dialog would advance the subject application to issuance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at any time at (312) 913-0001.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 13, 2006

By: Richard A. Machonkin  
Richard A. Machonkin  
Reg. No. 41,962